



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/830,811	08/30/2001	Colin D. MacCalman	27866/37317	1999

7590 11/17/2003

Gerstein E Noland
Marshall O'Toole Gerstein Murray & Borun
6300 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606-6402

EXAMINER

MCGARRY, SEAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1635

12

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/830,811

Applicant(s)

MACCALMAN, COLIN D.

Examiner

Sean R McGarry

Art Unit

1635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8, 14-16, 20 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-13 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election with traverse of Group III in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that it would not place an unrealistic burden on the examiner to search and examine Groups I-IV and that Patent No. 5,646,250 does not disclose the use of cadherin-11 as an indicator or in modulation of differentiation and neoplastic transformation of cells. This is not found persuasive because US 5,646,250 discloses the modulation of cadherin-11 in cells including neuroblastoma cells (see columns 4 and 14, for example).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 6-8, 14-16, 20 and 21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 10.

Claims 1-5, 9-13 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

The claimed and elected invention is drawn to the modulation of differentiation or neoplastic transformation of cells via the administration of antisense to cad-11. the invention is drawn to the treatment cancer and for the process preventing or aborting a pregnancy via antisense oligonucleotides targeted to cad-11.

The specification discloses SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2 which are antisense oligonucleotides that bind to and inhibit Cad-11 in cells in culture. However, the claims claim are directed to encompass any antisense oligonucleotide targeted to any form of what may be considered cad-1 (for example, sequences that are substantially identical or which will hybridize to SEQ ID NO: 1, antisense targeted to corresponding sequences from other species, mutated sequences, allelic variants, splice variants, etc. . . . The specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

With the exception of the use SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2 in cells in culture, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed antisense oligonucleotides required for use in the methods, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a

mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993). University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that:

...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.* , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); *In re Gosteli* , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("[T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood*, 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

An adequate written description of a DNA, such as the cDNA of the recombinant plasmids and microorganisms of the '525 patent, "requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties," not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention. *Fiers v. Revel* , 984 F.2d 1164, 1171, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Accordingly, "an adequate written description of a DNA requires more than a mere statement that

it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it; what is required is a description of the DNA itself." *Id.* at 1170, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

The name cDNA is not itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA's relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA. Describing a method of preparing a cDNA or even describing the protein that the cDNA encodes, as the example does, does not necessarily describe the cDNA itself. No sequence information indicating which nucleotides constitute human cDNA appears in the patent, as appears for rat cDNA in Example 5 of the patent. Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention of claim 5.

The instant specification provides only two examples of antisense oligonucleotides used in a cell culture. The specification does not provide sufficient examples that such that one would know the structure of compounds required for the practice of the claimed method, for example. The specification does not provide what the structure/sequence of the antisense oligonucleotides required for use in the methods would be. The determination of effective antisense oligonucleotides is empirical. Branch [TIBS Vol. 23, February 1998] addresses the need to empirically find

antisense sequences with the following statements: "[b]ecause it is very difficult to predict what portions of an RNA molecule will be accessible *in vivo*, effective antisense molecules must be determined empirically by screening large number of candidates for their ability to act inside cells."; "[b]inding is the rare exception rather than the rule, and antisense molecules are excluded from most complementary sites. [s]ince accessibility cannot be predicted, rational design of antisense molecules is not possible."; and, "[t]he relationship between accessibility to ODN binding and vulnerability to ODN-mediated antisense inhibition *in vivo* is beginning to be explored. . . [i]t is not yet clear whether *in vitro* screening techniques. . . will identify ODNs that are effective *in vivo*."

Applicant appears to be claiming a method of treatment where a compound that is necessary to practice that method is described only in terms of its function (ie to inhibit expression such that a treatment *in vivo* is effected). The specification provides only two antisense oligonucleotides that inhibit in cell culture where the only means left for one to find compounds that function in claims is by a trial and error process.

Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The instant invention is drawn to methods of treating cancer and for the prevention or aborting of pregnancy via the administration of antisense oligonucleotides. The instant specification shows that the administration of antisense (OB-1) to prostate cancer cells caused loss of cell viability in these cells and showed that administration of the same antisense to trophoblast cells caused cells to fail to upregulate cad-11 and became, over time, unviable. The specification provides general guidance for the methods of the inventions but does not provide any specificity in the practice of the claimed methods.

The specification fails to provide guidance or examples that would show by correlation the practice of the instant invention such that a treatment or prevention of pregnancy or abortion of a pregnancy is effected. The art of antisense therapy is an unpredictable art where specific guidance in the antisense sequence and modes of delivery of antisense oligonucleotides for any particular treatment (a specific cancer, for example) is needed.

Branch [TIBS Vol. 23, February 1998] addresses the unpredictability and the problems faced in the antisense art with the following statements: “[a]ntisense molecules and ribozymes capture the imagination with their promise of rational drug design and exquisite specificity. [h]owever, they are far more difficult to produce than was originally anticipated, and their ability to eliminate the function of a single gene has never been proven.”; “[t]o minimize unwanted non-antisense effects, investigators are searching for antisense compounds and ribozymes whose targets sites are particularly vulnerable to attack. [t]his is a challenging quest.”; “[h]owever, their unpredictability

confounds research applications of nucleic acid reagents.”; “[n]on-antisense effects are not the only impediments to rational antisense drug design. [t]he internal structures of target RNAs and their associations with cellular proteins create physical barriers, which render most potential binding sites inaccessible to antisense molecules.”; “Years of investigation can be required to figure out what an ‘antisense’ molecule is actually doing. . . .”; “Because knowledge of their underlying mechanism is typically acting, non-antisense effects muddy the waters.”; “because biologically active compounds generally have a variety of effects, dose-response curves are always needed to establish a compounds primary pharmacological identity. [a]ntisense compounds are no exception. [a]s is true of all pharmaceuticals, the value of a potential antisense drug can only be judged after its intended clinical use is known, and quantitative information about its dose-response curve and therapeutic index is known.”; [c]ompared to the dose response curves of conventional drugs, which typically span two to three orders of magnitude, those of antisense drugs, extend only across a narrow concentration range.”; “[b]ecause it is very difficult to predict what portions of an RNA molecule will be accessible *in vivo*, effective antisense molecules must be determined empirically by screening large number of candidates for their ability to act inside cells.”; “[b]inding is the rare exception rather than the rule, and antisense molecules are excluded from most complementary sites. [s]ince accessibility cannot be predicted, rational design of antisense molecules is not possible.”; and, “[t]he relationship between accessibility to ODN binding and vulnerability to ODN-mediated antisense inhibition *in vivo* is beginning to be explored. . . . [i]t is not yet clear whether *in vitro* screening techniques. . .

will identify ODNs that are effective *in vivo*.” Jen et al [STEM CELLS Vol. 18:307-319, 2000] discuss antisense based therapy and the challenges that remain before the use of antisense becomes routine in a therapeutic setting. Jen et al discuss the advances made in the art but also indicate that progress needs to be made in the art. In the conclusion of their review Jen et al assert “[g]iven the state of the art, it is perhaps not surprising that effective and efficient clinical translation of the antisense strategy has remained elusive.” It is also stated “[t]he key challenges to this field have been outlined above. [I]t is clear that they will have to be solved if this approach to specific antitumor therapy is to become a useful treatment approach. [a] large number of diverse and talented groups are working on this problem, and we can all hope that their efforts will help lead to establishment of this promising form of therapy.” It is clear from Jen et al that the state of the art of antisense is unpredictable and those highly skilled in the art are working towards making the art of antisense therapy more predictable but have many obstacles to overcome. Agrawal [TIBTECH, Vol. 14:376-387, October 1996] states the following: “[t]here are two crucial parameters in drug design: the first is the identification of an appropriate target in the disease process, and the second is finding an appropriate molecule that has specific recognition and affinity for the target, thereby interfering in the disease process” (page376); “[o]ligonucleotide must be taken up by cells in order to be effective. [s]everal reports have shown that efficient uptake of oligonucleotides occurs in a variety of cell lines, including primary cells whereas other reports indicate negligible cellular uptake of oligonucleotides. Cellular uptake of oligonucleotides is a complex process; it depends on many factors, including the cell

type, the stage of the cell cycle, the concentration of serum . . . [i]t is therefore, difficult to generalize that all oligonucleotides are taken up in all cells with the same efficiency.” (Page 378); “[m]icroinjection or using lipid carriers to supply an oligonucleotide in cell culture increases the potency of the oligonucleotide in cell culture, but it is not clear how relevant this approach is for *in vivo* situations.” (Page 379); “[a]ny antisense activity observed in such artificial systems [cell culture] should be scrutinized carefully with respect to the disease process and its applicability to *in vivo* situations.” (Page 379).

The references above clearly show that the art of antisense therapy is an unpredictable art and evidence that the general guidance provided in the instant specification is not sufficient for one in the art to practice the instant invention without the need to perform undue trial and error experimentation. The undue trial and error experimentation including, finding effective antisense sequences that may be useful in any particular disease or cell type, and also to find an effective mode of delivery for the treatment of any condition in an *in vivo* environment where the art has shown this delivery to be unpredictable, for example.

Claims 17-19 provides for the use of “an agent that interferes with cad-11”, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 17-19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

If applicant desires priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) based upon a previously filed application, specific reference to the earlier filed application must be made in the instant application. For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121 or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of the applications. This should appear as the first sentence of the specification following the title, preferably as a separate paragraph unless it appears in an application data sheet. The status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) should also be included. If a parent application has become a patent, the expression "now Patent No. ____" should follow the filing date of the parent application. If a parent application has become abandoned, the expression "now abandoned" should follow the filing date of the parent application.

If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an

Art Unit: 1635


international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A priority claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean R McGarry whose telephone number is (703)305-7028. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John LeGuyader can be reached on (703) 308-0447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

SRM



SEAN MCGARRY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
(63)-